

September 28, 2005
Case No.: AUS920010643US1 (9000/54)
Serial No.: 10/042,503
Filed: January 9, 2002
Page 7 of 9

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Applicants thank the Examiner for her many courtesies shown during the September 7, 2005 interview. Although no agreement was reached, Applicants are confident that prosecution of this matter has been advanced.

A. Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Lee

The §103(a) rejection of claims 1-18 is traversed. Each and every claim element must be taught or suggested in at least as great detail as claimed in order to maintain this rejection.

Lee does not teach or suggest the limitation "the log statement including a retention level indicator" as claimed in claims 1, 9, and 11. The Examiner's allegation that 'it would have been obvious' is traversed.

Even if the Examiner's arguments of page 5 are an accurate representation of the teachings of Lee (which Applicants do not accept), to maintain this rejection, Lee would have to teach the invention in as great detail as claimed. Since Lee does not address the retention of errors in an error log, Lee simply cannot support a §103(a) rejection. That Lee 'explicitly deals with the software failure fault tolerant and management' (sic) does not mean that Lee teaches the claimed elements in as great detail as claimed.

Additionally, despite the Examiner's argument, Lee does not teach or suggest that the logger is built into a base class of an object oriented application framework, as claimed in claims 5 and 15. At most, Lee teaches a graphical user interface module providing information to other modules in order to initiate development of a packet to be transmitted (see the cited section at column 3, lines 27-31), and an open database connectivity concept used by WOSA structures that provides an interface with a common language for Windows applications to gain access to a database on a network (see, column 5, lines 12-15).

September 28, 2005
Case No.: AUS920010643US1 (9000/54)
Serial No.: 10/042,503
Filed: January 9, 2002
Page 8 of 9

Furthermore, the Examiner mistakenly cites column 13, lines 3-7 as disclosing deleting an application thread's log statements after thread death detection. Rather, that section merely teaches that any new platforms which are later added or removed do not change system operation or require new software applications in order to effectuate the fault sensing and information delivery to a Remote Central Interface Unit for diagnosis and response. The claimed element is not taught or suggested anywhere else in Lee, either.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-18 is requested.

B. Claim 19

Claim 19 is allowable because the prior art, alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claim. No new matter has been added with the addition of claim 19, support for which is found, *inter alia*, on page 8 of the specification.

September 28, 2005
Case No.: AUS920010643US1 (9000/54)
Serial No.: 10/042,503
Filed: January 9, 2002
Page 9 of 9

SUMMARY

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-19 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: September 28, 2005

Respectfully Submitted
Daniel S. Lowen, et. al.



Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicants

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113